

# Exhibit 6

# OPUS2

Skatteforvaltningen v Solo Capital Partners LLP & Others

Day 17MT

May 21, 2024

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: 020 3008 6619

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: <https://www.opus2.com>

1 affirm Mr Shah before we do anything.  
 2 MR JONES: Your Lordship reminds me that that might be  
 3 appropriate. He needs to be affirmed, thank you. I had  
 4 that firmly in my mind at 9.30 but I'm afraid it slipped  
 5 my mind in the ensuing 30 minutes.  
 6 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: Thank you.  
 7 MR SANJAY SHAH (affirmed)  
 8 Examination—in-chief by MR JONES  
 9 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: Yes, Mr Jones, thank you.  
 10 MR JONES: My Lord, thank you. Can we have {V/27/1},  
 11 please. Thank you very much.  
 12 Mr Shah, I'm going to ask you to look at this on  
 13 screen because I understand that is easier for you.  
 14 This document is headed:  
 15 "First witness statement of Sanjay Shah."  
 16 For the main trial, and in the top right—hand corner  
 17 you will see it has the date of 19 January 2024. My  
 18 first question is do you recall making and signing that  
 19 statement?  
 20 A. Yes, that's correct.  
 21 Q. Now, please will we go over to {V/27/130}. You see  
 22 there in the last paragraph, under 719, you will see  
 23 a certificate headed:  
 24 "Confirmation of compliance and statement of truth."  
 25 A. Yes, I can see that.

13

1 Q. If you go over to the next page {V/27/131}, please,  
 2 under that certificate, is that your signature, above  
 3 the date of 19 January 2024?  
 4 A. Yes, that's my signature.  
 5 Q. I will come back to ask you more about this statement  
 6 when we have looked at the remainder of the statements,  
 7 Mr Shah. Can we now go to {V/28/1}. This, as you can  
 8 see, is headed:  
 9 "Second witness statement of Sanjay Shah."  
 10 Can you see the date of this? I can't see it on  
 11 screen, but the date is 1 February 2024. Can we go  
 12 over, please, to page {V/28/2}. Just read to yourself  
 13 paragraph 4, please, on this page.  
 14 A. Okay, I've read that now.  
 15 Q. Thank you. Do you recall making this statement for the  
 16 purpose set out in paragraph 4?  
 17 A. Yes, I do.  
 18 Q. Please could we go now in the same document to  
 19 {V/28/13}. Here we see a confirmation of compliance and  
 20 statement of truth in the same form as the one we looked  
 21 at earlier and below it is your signature. Could you  
 22 confirm, please, that that is your signature?  
 23 A. Yes, it is.  
 24 Q. Thank you. I will come back to ask you more about this  
 25 when we have looked at the next two documents. Could we

14

1 now look at {V/34/1}. This one is headed in the top —  
 2 in the tramlines:  
 3 "Third main trial witness statement ..."  
 4 And in the top right—hand corner it is dated  
 5 22 April 2024. If we go over to page {V/34/2}, please.  
 6 Will you simply read paragraphs 3 and 4 to yourself,  
 7 just to remind yourself of what is there.  
 8 A. Okay, I've read those.  
 9 Q. Thank you. Do you recall making this statement in order  
 10 to provide the updated version of your PowerPoint  
 11 presentation?  
 12 A. Yes, I do remember.  
 13 Q. Thank you. You will see at the foot of the page the  
 14 text for the confirmation of compliance and statement of  
 15 truth. Can we now go over, please, to page {V/34/3} in  
 16 this document. Thank you. Is that your signature?  
 17 A. Yes, it is.  
 18 Q. Have you been able to review this statement and the  
 19 updated PowerPoint presentation before starting your  
 20 evidence here this morning?  
 21 A. Yes, I have.  
 22 Q. And to the best of your knowledge and belief, are the  
 23 contents true and accurate?  
 24 A. Yes, they are.  
 25 Q. Thank you. Could we now please go to {V/38/1}. This is

15

1 headed:  
 2 "Fourth witness statement of Sanjay Shah."  
 3 And in the top right—hand corner you will see the  
 4 date of 13 May. Will you read the first line of  
 5 paragraph 1 at the foot of this page, please, and then  
 6 tell me when you have read it.  
 7 A. Yes, I have read that now.  
 8 Q. If we go to page {V/38/2}, please. Thank you. Just  
 9 read the first line at the top.  
 10 A. Yes, I have done that.  
 11 Q. Do you recall making this fourth statement last week?  
 12 A. Yes, I do.  
 13 Q. Would you now please, operator, go to page {V/38/26} in  
 14 this same document. Do we see there, is that your  
 15 signature above the date of 13 May 2024, Mr Shah?  
 16 A. Yes, that is my signature.  
 17 Q. Just for the sake of completeness, have you given your  
 18 approval this morning to a revised version of this  
 19 statement, which includes the certificate of compliance  
 20 with PD57?  
 21 A. Yes, that's correct.  
 22 Q. Thank you. Now —  
 23 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: Mr Jones, just before you now move  
 24 to I imagine the next stage of the formality of  
 25 verifying, including in relation to earlier statements,

16

May 21, 2024

Skatteforvaltningen v Solo Capital Partners LLP &amp; Others

Day 17MT

1       the trades without external shares or money, and netting  
 2       would occur if Solo was dealing with another bank or  
 3       custodian outside, and in that sense the net amount of  
 4       shares or money involved is zero.

5       Q. Mr Shah, the last answer you have given almost portrays  
 6       this as if this was not something which was coordinated  
 7       and determined in order to produce the result of a net  
 8       settlement of zero. That's not what you are saying?  
 9       A. I don't agree. I don't agree with you that -- I don't  
 10      agree with that comment that you just made, that nothing  
 11      was pre-arranged.

12      Q. When you say you don't agree that nothing was  
 13      pre-arranged, are you saying you agree that things were  
 14      pre-arranged?

15      A. Well, I don't know the difference between  
 16      pre-arrangement or pre-planning, but everything was  
 17      certainly structured in a very rigid way, yes.

18      Q. In order to produce an outcome?

19      A. Yes, but that is a different conversation to talking  
 20      about netting with external counterparties, so I just  
 21      want to be clear that Solo posted -- made account  
 22      postings to their clients' accounts which required no  
 23      external money or shares. The term net settlement --  
 24      internal net settlement, sorry, those three words of are  
 25      a bit of a Frankenstein's monster; it doesn't really

113

1       mean anything.

2       Q. I just want to go back to the slight quibble you have  
 3       with the concept of net settling to zero, or netting to  
 4       zero. Can we just look at your fourth witness statement  
 5       {V/38/8}, please.

6       Under the section D, you can see the heading there,  
 7       at the top of the page, "Automated trading." In  
 8       paragraph 12 you are addressing what the Octave and  
 9       Broker mesh systems were intended to achieve. This is  
 10      obviously much later. But do you see, if you just look,  
 11      for example, at paragraph 12.1, if you want to just read  
 12      that to yourself?

13      A. Yes. We can go over the page. {V/38/9}.

14      Q. And also paragraph 12.2, please.

15      A. Yes, I can see the reference to netting to zero.

16      Q. I think there are two or three references to netting to  
 17      zero. So, Mr Shah, I just want to understand. You are  
 18      not now suggesting, are you, that it was not part of --  
 19      I'm going to call it the structure of the trading model.  
 20      You are not now suggesting that the structure of your  
 21      trading model was one which was not designed to produce  
 22      a netting to zero? I know there are lots of "nots" in  
 23      that. I apologise.

24      A. Yes, just to clarify. I have given a lot of thought to  
 25      the use of the word "netting." Netting, its actual

114

1       meaning is netting between banks or between custodians,  
 2       so between one party and an external party. So it would  
 3       be more accurate to say not that the trades netted to  
 4       zero, but that the trades settled to zero.

5       Q. Mr Shah, you --  
 6       A. But I'm not in any disagreement over the model we have  
 7       been discussing for the last nine years.

8       Q. I don't want to get too held up on this, Mr Shah, but  
 9       the witness statement I just showed you I think was  
 10      produced last week and you confirmed its accuracy this  
 11      morning.

12      A. Yes.

13      Q. Yes.

14      A. Yes.

15      Q. So are you content -- you know, I don't want to get  
 16      involved in an argument about terminology, because this  
 17      case is not ultimately -- or not entirely about  
 18      terminology.

19      A. Yes.

20      Q. Can we stick with, even if you think there may be  
 21      a different way of expressing it, the idea that what  
 22      your model did involve was enabling a netting --  
 23      internal net settling to zero, between your clients, so  
 24      as to ensure that no one involved in the trading would  
 25      need to provide any leverage?

115

1       A. Yes, I can live with that.

2       Q. Thank you.

3       A. I agree.

4       MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: For my purposes, since you and  
 5       Mr Rabinowitz have stumbled slightly there over  
 6       different ways of using terminology, might we also bring  
 7       up {V/34.1/32}. It may be a diagram of yours that  
 8       Mr Rabinowitz will have questions about at a later  
 9       point, because it includes lots of information that  
 10      cover lots of different aspects of the case.

11      But for this question at this stage for me, Mr Shah,  
 12      ignore the fact that in this particular diagram you have  
 13      71 separate investors and 11 separate short sellers, so  
 14      ignore those numbers, but am I right to understand that  
 15      this is a diagram of yours indicating the kind of  
 16      settlement loop that is involved in the Solo Model that  
 17      was implemented?

18      A. Yes, that's correct.

19      MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: And what you are therefore talking  
 20      about at the moment with Mr Rabinowitz -- whether we  
 21      call it netting it to zero or settling to zero, or  
 22      whatever we decide to call it -- is the fact that every  
 23      pair of black arrows, each pair comes into a party and  
 24      then goes out, so there's, for example, a sell into the  
 25      investors and a lend out by the investors; there is

116

1 a lend in to one set of borrowers and a lend out. So  
 2 each of those pairs of black arrows has to have the same  
 3 total volume of shares --

4 A. Yes, that's correct.

5 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: -- as an integral part of the  
 6 model that you were structuring; is that right?

7 A. Yes, yes. But I just want to try and make clear that  
 8 netting may suggest that trades are cancelling each  
 9 other out, but that's not the case.

10 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: Don't worry, Mr Shah, I'm well  
 11 aware that that is likely to be why you then wanted to  
 12 qualify the use of terminology.

13 A. Yes.

14 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: And there may be further questions  
 15 for you from others about understandings of what in  
 16 terms of the transaction analysis is happening. But the  
 17 simple factual question, I think, is that the model  
 18 required, as you intended it, that each black arrow  
 19 coming into a party or a group of parties would be for  
 20 a certain volume of shares that equaled the volume of  
 21 shares going out from that same group of parties on the  
 22 other black arrow; correct?

23 A. Yes, that's correct, my Lord.

24 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: And similarly, that the volume of  
 25 what will be booked as cash movements on the red circuit

1 as the GSS Trading Model, okay. So if that's the  
 2 expression I use, you will know that is what I mean.

3 A. Okay, thank you.

4 Q. Forgive me when I am inconsistent. Can we go, please,  
 5 to {V/34.1/1}, which I think is what we have except  
 6 a different page. Thank you. This is, as you will  
 7 recognise, the PowerPoint presentation that you produced  
 8 in the last few months for your criminal proceedings;  
 9 correct?

10 A. Yes, that's correct.

11 Q. If we can then go to page {V/34.1/30} of this, this is  
 12 your explanation of what I'm referring to as the  
 13 GSS Model. You have called it the Solo Custody Model.  
 14 It doesn't matter. You will obviously be very familiar  
 15 with this, yes?

16 A. Yes, that's correct.

17 Q. You say in the fourth bullet point that:

18 "The (mandatory) use of netting ... [means that] ...  
 19 all depot positions and cash balances [will be] zero at  
 20 the start and at the end of trading ~..."

21 Do you see that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And that is why, as you say, the accounts held by Solo  
 24 therefore showed no balances; correct?

25 A. Yes, the accounts with its subcustodians such as

119

1 has to be equal sum in, equal sum out, or the model is  
 2 not doing what it is intended to do?

3 A. Yes, that is correct too.

4 MR JUSTICE ANDREW BAKER: Thank you.

5 MR RABINOWITZ: I'm grateful, my Lord.

6 You viewed the model net settling, however you want  
 7 to describe it, as potentially game changing for you and  
 8 Solo, yes?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And you considered that it provided the answer to all of  
 11 Solo's problems with accessing funds, correct?

12 A. Yes. Yes, funds were not needed for this model,  
 13 correct.

14 Q. It would be fair to describe Solo, if it adopted this  
 15 approach, as operating in its own ecosystem with nothing  
 16 to go in or come out of Solo, correct?

17 A. Yes. I think those are the words that I used, yes.

18 Q. You also say in your evidence that the trades were  
 19 designed to work without external movement of cash or  
 20 shares, yes?

21 A. Yes, that's correct.

22 Q. Just whilst this trading model by which you sought to  
 23 achieve this objective is sometimes referred to in the  
 24 documents for the court as the Solo Model, for the sake  
 25 of clarity I'm going to try and refer to it consistently

1 JP Morgan, yes.

2 Q. So the accounts held by Solo showed no balances, yes?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. In other words, Solo does not hold, on this model, any  
 5 aggregate positive balance of shares at the beginning or  
 6 end of trading; correct?

7 A. Yes, with its subcustodians, correct.

8 Q. And it did not hold any aggregate positive cash balance  
 9 at the beginning or end of trading, correct?

10 A. Yes, that's correct.

11 Q. You have previously called this Solo's trade secret,  
 12 yes?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And you have said that because of this you didn't want  
 15 to share it with anybody, correct?

16 A. Yes, that's correct.

17 Q. And implicit in this being a secret, Mr Shah, not to be  
 18 shared with anybody, is obviously it was not something  
 19 any of your competitors were doing, otherwise it would  
 20 not have been your secret; correct?

21 A. Yes, it was my understanding that my competitors were  
 22 not operating a model like this.

23 Q. Yes. They were all still using leverage for their  
 24 trades, yes?

25 A. Yes. But I do need to make a distinction between what

120